

Defining the bio-energetic limits of
***Symbiodinium* sp's host-symbiont**
relationship under future climate
scenarios

Verena Schrameyer

Dipl. Biol. University of Bremen

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy, School of the Environment, University of Technology,

Sydney March 2013

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Student





Acknowledgements-Danksagung

Ich moechte mich von tiefstem Herzen bei meinen Eltern Rita und Bernhard Schrameyer und meiner Schwester Uta fuer ihre unsagbare Unterstuetzung bedanken. Ihr habt immer an mich geglaubt und mich immer wieder von neuem motiviert und habt mich dadurch an ein lang ertraeumtes Ziel gebracht. Ausserdem moechte ich mich bei meinen lieben Grosseltern Bork bedanken, meiner Oma, die mir immer die neuesten Zeitungsberichte ueber meeresbiologische Themen zugesandt hat und mein Opa, der mich als Kleinkind fuer die Natur begeistert hat und damit fuers Leben.

A special ‘thank you’ goes to Kasper Elgetti Brodersen who greatly supported me and always made me laugh in the last and especially hectic phase. I also thank Bruce D. Wilkie for supporting me to pursue my dream and take on this ‘PhD journey’ despite having to give up a lot to accompany me and my dream. I am very grateful for the support and friendship I received from people around me in the past and present during my ‘PhD journey’. People who have been great friends and mentors cheering me up during not so bright times, as well as celebrating the good times during the past 4 years: Daniel and Daniel, Thilde, Radka, Andre, Louisa, Nicole, Daniela, Ingo, Mathieu, Ute, Davey, Linda, Wiebke, Julia, Beatrix, Tanja, Kirsten, Nina, Sandra, Nathalie and everyone I forgot.

Very special thanks goes to my dear friend Wiebke Kraemer for all the invaluable discussions and her inspiring mind; thank you for the the great time, partially supported by portwine (thanks Paul), on Heron island, despite the lack of sleep and experiment craziness. Also I would like to thank my eager honours student Mitch Duley for assistance with data collection and being an A* student, Malin Gustafsson for great fieldwork assistance and Deniz for volunteering for me in the lab.

It was a great pleasure to be part of the Aquatic processes group (APG) at UTS and I thank the team and other UTS people for the last 4 years with all its ups and downs for your support, enthusiasm and joy; Noni, Malin, Sutinee, Olivia, Katherina, Ernesto, Vinod, Marlene, Charlie, Jessica, Ball, Kieran, Louisa, Joh, Stacey, John and all the rest.

I especially thank my primary supervisor Professor Peter Ralph for allowing me to pursue the path of my PhD project the way I did and to support my decisions and ideas. It has been a journey with various complexities, where Peter was always a great mentor, even though I sometimes didn't accept suggestions in the first place, I am very grateful for the way I was guided. I also thank Ross Hill and Anthony W.D Larkum for their support and guidance; the manuscripts wouldn't have improved the way they did through their thoughtful and very honest feedback, which certainly broadened my perspective and way of thinking.

Prototype testing of the developed photobioreactor during my PhD, partly took place at the laboratories of the Marine Biological Laboratory of the University of Copenhagen in Helsingør, Denmark, where I would like to thank Michael Kühl to allow me to use his facilities and hosting me during that time. Thanks to Lars Behrendt for his great algae culturing for those testruns and bringing kilos of Piratos to the lab for support. I would like to thank the UTS technicians Greg Evans, Greg Dalsanto and Geoff McCredie for technical support and the inspiring chats in the Science workshop. Also I have to thank Daniel Nielsen for constructive discussions during the development of the data analysis.

This study was partially funded by UTS Plant Functional Biology and Climate Change Cluster, ARC DP110105200 (PR). Corals were collected under GBRMPA permit No. G09/30854.1. I thank UTS to provide me with a living allowance scholarship as well as supporting me to obtain a tuition fee scholarship.

Table of Contents

List of Figures.....	xiii
List of Tables	xxii
Abbreviations	xxv
Abstract.....	xxviii
Chapter 1	1
1.1 Coral reef ecosystems	2
1.2 Coral Symbiosis	5
<i>1.2.1 Calcification and photosynthesis interdependency.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>1.2.2 DIC uptake and symbiotic dependencies</i>	<i>9</i>
1.3 Climate change and El Niño-Southern Oscillation	11
<i>1.3.2 Climate change and coral bleaching events</i>	<i>12</i>
1.4 Mechanistic understanding of coral bleaching	14
<i>1.4.1 Coral bleaching during non-stressful environmental conditions</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>1.4.2 Algal-stress response towards extreme environmental conditions</i>	<i>15</i>
1.5 Photophysiology of <i>Symbiodinium</i>	16
<i>1.5.1 Photosynthetic light harvesting in Symbiodinium.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>1.5.2 Photosynthetic machinery of Symbiodinium</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>1.5.3 Energy quenching within the photosynthetic apparatus</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>1.5.4 Photoprotection.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>1.5.4.1 Xanthophyll cycle.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>1.5.5 Photodamage</i>	<i>22</i>
1.6 Research Objectives and Thesis Outline.....	25
1.7 Declaraction of author contribution	28

Chapter 2.1	30
2.1.1 Introduction.....	32
2.1.2 Materials and Methods.....	35
2.1.2.1 <i>Sample preparation</i>	35
2.1.2.2 <i>Experimental set-up</i>	36
2.1.2.3 <i>Experimental conditions</i>	37
2.1.2.4 <i>Data analysis</i>	40
2.1.3 Results and Discussion	47
2.1.3.1 <i>Quenching in Symbiodinium cells under stress conditions</i>	47
2.1.3.2 <i>Kinetic target modeling</i>	49
2.1.3.3 <i>Effects of light stress</i>	53
2.1.3.4 <i>Temperature stress and bleaching conditions</i>	54
2.1.3.5 <i>Molecular model for thylakoid reorganization</i>	55
2.1.3.6 <i>Breakdown of lateral segregation and linear electron flow</i>	58
2.1.4 References.....	61
Chapter 2.2	66
2.2.1 Introduction.....	67
2.2.2 Materials and Methods.....	70
2.2.2.1 <i>Experimental design</i>	70
2.2.2.2 <i>PAM fluorometry</i>	72
2.2.2.3 <i>Chlorophyll emission spectra at 77K</i>	73
2.2.2.4 <i>Pigment analyses</i>	74
2.2.2.5 <i>Statistical analyses</i>	75
2.2.3 Results.....	76
2.2.3.1 <i>Chlorophyll fluorescence</i>	76

2.2.3.2 77K fluorescence emissions	78
2.2.3.3 Pigment analyses	86
2.2.3.4 Cell counts	89
2.2.4 Discussion	90
2.2.4.1 Stressor triggered LHC movement.....	91
2.2.4.2 Regulation and mechanisms of LHC movement	93
2.2.4.3 Chl a fluorescence and absorption cross section.....	94
2.2.4.5 Conclusion	95
2.2.5 References.....	97
Chapter 3	105
3.1 Introduction.....	106
3.2 Materials and Methods.....	111
3.2.1 Coral collection and preparation	111
3.2.2 Treatment and sampling regime	112
3.2.3 Chlorophyll a fluorescence	113
3.2.3.1 Chl a fluorescence-based photorepair requirement.....	115
3.2.4 Post-measurement sample processing	116
3.2.5 Photosynthetic and photoprotective pigment analyses	116
3.2.6 D1 protein concentrations	118
3.2.6.1 Protein Extraction and Assay	118
3.2.6.2 Quantitative Immunoblotting	119
3.2.6.3 D1 concentration-based photorepair requirement	119
3.2.7 Abiotic parameters.....	120
3.2.8 Statistical analyses.....	122
3.3 Results.....	122
3.3.1 Maximum quantum yield at midday and at night time.....	122

3.3.2 <i>psbA</i> protein concentrations	125
3.3.3 Results of the two independent photorepair estimates.....	128
3.3.4 Chlorophyll <i>a</i> fluorescence quenching analysis	129
3.3.5 Photosynthetic productivity.....	131
3.3.6 Pigment analyses	133
3.3.7 Cell density.....	135
3.4 Discussion	137
3.4.1 Dissipative energy quenching	137
3.4.2 Differential photorepair in the two species examined	138
3.4.3 Inference about photorepair	139
3.4.4 Energy expenditure for photorepair	141
3.4.5 Conclusion	143
3.5 References	144
3.6 Supplementary information	152
Chapter 4	154
4.1 Introduction.....	155
4.2 Materials and Procedures	159
4.2.1 Instrumental setup.....	159
4.2.2 Gaseous DIC and O ₂ exchange measurements.....	161
4.2.3 Measurement protocol	162
4.2.4 PBR application for coral holobiont/symbioses assessment	163
4.3 Assessment.....	164
4.3.1 Light source capacity and resolution.....	164
4.3.2 Gas circuit volume	165
4.3.3 Gaseous exchange in the PBR and total alkalinity of incubation seawater	166
4.3.3.1 Dissolved inorganic carbon speciation at different light intensities	166

4.3.3.2 Dissolved inorganic carbon speciation at different salinity regimes	168
4.3.4 Gas- and liquid-phase equilibration times	170
4.3.5 O ₂ concentration measurement	173
4.3.6 Coral holobiont gaseous exchange and photosynthetic efficiency	174
4.4 Discussion	181
4.4.1 Benefits of the photobioreactor setup	181
4.4.2 Dissolved inorganic carbon exchange	182
4.4.3 Gas-phase of the photobioreactor	182
4.5 Comments and recommendations	183
4.5.1 Shortfalls of utilised specimen and data analysis	184
4.5.2 Alternative electron pathways	185
4.5.3. Demonstration of stoichiometric analysis of theoretical electron flow	185
4.6 References	188
Chapter 5	196
5.1 Introduction	197
5.2 Materials and Methods	201
5.2.1 Coral collection and preparation	201
5.2.2 Experimental setup	201
5.2.3 Experimental protocol	202
5.2.4 Chlorophyll fluorescence	203
5.2.5 Curve fitting	204
5.2.6 CO ₂ light compensation point (CO ₂ E _c)	205
5.2.7 Oxygen microsensor measurements	205
5.2.8 Metabolic gas exchange analyses	207
5.2.9 Biometric measures	208
5.2.10 Statistical analyses	209

5.3 Results.....	210
5.3.1 Biometric measures.....	210
5.3.2 Photosynthetic measurements.....	211
5.3.3 Gross primary production and gross photosynthesis rates	213
5.3.4 Light and dark respiration.....	216
5.3.5 CO ₂ compensation point (E_c) irradiance	218
5.3.6 P/R ratios	219
5.4 Discussion.....	221
5.4.1 Light utilisation and gross primary productivity.....	221
5.4.2 Gross photosynthesis and light respiratory activity	223
5.4.3 Light-driven mitochondrial processes	225
5.4.3.1 Oxygen consuming pathways.....	225
5.4.3.2 Dissolved inorganic carbon as a substrate for light-driven processes.....	226
5.4.4 Measuring gross photosynthesis rates	227
5.4.5 Photosynthetic energy dissipation	229
5.4.6 Conclusion	230
5.5 References.....	232
Chapter 6	242
6.1 Assessing <i>Symbiodinium</i> 's photoprotective capacity and bio-energetic limits	243
6.2 NPQ capacity of cultured <i>Symbiodinium</i>	243
6.3 High light stress impact upon <i>in hospite Symbiodinium</i>	245
6.4 Symbiotic interdependencies within the coral holobiont.....	246
6.5 Ecological significance	249
6.6 Conclusion	251
6.7 Remarks about instruments and methodologies used	252

6.7.1 77K and ultrafast fluorescence	252
6.7.2 Application of the photobioreactor.....	253
6.8 Key findings.....	255
6.9 Future research objectives.....	256
General References	257

List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Four cell layer model of a coral; simplified view of coral host cell harboring algal symbionts (indicated as zoox) in the upper cell layer of the coelenteron and calcifying cell layers below the gastrodermis in the calicodermis (adopted from Jokiel 2011)..... 7

Figure 1.2: The linear electron transport (LET) through the "Z" scheme indicating energetic redox potential on the left side; LET from water (H_2O) to ultimate electron acceptor $NADP^+$; three major protein complexes are involved in running the "Z" scheme: (1) **Photosystem II**; (2) **Cytochrome bf complex** (containing $Cytb_6$; FeS; and $Cytf$) and (3) **Photosystem I**. Abbreviations and explanation: **Mn**-manganese complex containing 4 Mn atoms, bound to Photosystem II (PSII) reaction center; **Tyr** for a particular tyrosine in PSII; **O₂** for oxygen evolved through oxidation of water; **H⁺** for protons (proton gradient inducing ATP synthesis is not indicated but needs to be considered as a product of LET); **P₆₈₀** for the reaction center chlorophyll (Chl) in PSII: it is the primary electron donor of PSII; Excited (Chl) **P₆₈₀*** light energy charged through harvested photon of light; **Pheo** for pheophytin molecule (the primary electron acceptor of PSII); **Q_A** for a plastoquinone molecule tightly bound to PSII; **Q_B** for another plastoquinone molecule that is loosely bound to PSII; **FeS** for Rieske Iron Sulfur protein; **Cyt. f** for Cytochrome f; **Cytb₆** (L and H) for Cytochrome b₆ (of Low and High Energy); **PC** for copper protein plastocyanin; **P₇₀₀** for the reaction center chlorophyll (Chl) of PSI; it is the primary electron donor of PSI; Excited (Chl) **P₇₀₀*** light energy charged through harvested photon of light; **A₀** for a special chlorophyll a molecule (primary electron acceptor of PSI); **A₁** for a phylloquinone (Vitamin K) molecule; **F_X**, **F_A**, and **F_B** are three separate Iron Sulfur Centers; **FD** for ferredoxin; and **FNR** for Ferredoxin NADP oxido Reductase (FNR); (adapted from Veit and Govindje 2000). 20

Figure 2.1.1: A - schematic of the experimental setup; B - schematic representation of the four different conditions applied to the *Symbiodinium* cells.39

Figure 2.1.2: Principles of kinetic models used for describing the primary reactions in the photosynthetic apparatus of *Symbiodinium* cells under the different treatments. A) kinetic chain describing PSII that is not involved in spillover with PSI; B) kinetic compartment describing peripheral antenna complexes that are associated neither with PSII nor with PSI; C) kinetic chains describing PSI and PSII involved in spillover. Model compartments: i) PSII/RC compartment – a combined antenna-RC compartment representing the PSII complexes together with their peripheral antenna, this compartment could either be involved in spillover with PSI or not; ii) PSI/RC compartment – a combined antenna-RC compartment accounting for PSI and its peripheral antenna; iii) radical pair (RP) compartments – accounting for the electron transfer reaction in each of the photosystems. *Note that several kinetic models reflecting previous knowledge about different structural and functional aspects of the studied samples were tested for compatibility with the retrieved experimental data before arriving at the proposed models.*41

Figure 2.1.3: Decay- (DAS) and Species-associated emission spectra (SAES) resulting from the kinetic modeling of the time resolved fluorescence data from *Symbiodinium* cells under the four treatments: A, E) F_C condition; B, F) F_{HL} condition; C, G) F_B condition; D, H) F_{HT} condition.48

Figure 2.1.4: Molecular model for thylakoid organization and their reorganization induced under elevated thermal stress. **A)** Under optimal growth temperature conditions, there exist two PSII pools: one that is involved in excitation spillover with PSI and another that is not; **B)** When cells are exposed to elevated temperature (with or without high light) a major

reorganization of the peripheral antenna of PSII occurs. In this state there is a homogeneous PSII-PSI distribution in the thylakoid membrane, causing strong spillover and the increase in the effective antenna size of PSI. There is also some (8%) dissociation of light harvesting antenna, previously attached to PSII. The model allows for the full relaxation of the heat-induced state if the exposure to elevated temperatures is mild and not very prolonged. Under long term heat stress permanent damage to the cells may be induced.....56

Figure 2.2.1: Overview of the 3 treatment incubations applied. Treatment 1: ($F_{\text{Heat+NPQ}}$) 11.5 h of combined thermal and high light stress; treatment 2: (F_{Heat}) 8 h of incubation in the dark with thermal stress exposure and 3.5 h of high light stress at the end of treatment incubation; treatment 3 (F_{NPQ}) high light stress exposure for 3.5 h.....72

Figure 2.2.2: Variable chlorophyll *a* fluorescence parameters at sampling times throughout treatment incubation; ramping time for thermal stress treatments is indicated as -2 and 0 h on the x-axis, where F_{NPQ} is displayed from 0; panel A: Maximum quantum yield (F_v/F_m) of all treatments, panel B: relative electron transport rate (rETR); $F_{\text{Heat+NPQ}}$: closed circles, F_{Heat} : closed triangles, F_{NPQ} : open triangles; Tukey-HSD grouping results are indicated in lower case letters (F_{NPQ} post-hoc analyses results are indicated as greek letters); $n=4$, mean \pm SEM are displayed.77

Figure 2.2.3: Difference spectra of 77K fluorescence emission amplitudes between wavelengths of 620 – 750 nm are displayed, panel A: F_{Heat} treatment; difference spectrum (dotted line) of T_{-2h} and T_0 , original T_{-2h} (dashed line) and T_0 (straight line) fluorescence emission spectra, panel B: $F_{\text{Heat+NPQ}}$ treatment; difference spectrum (dotted line) of T_{-2h} and T_0 , T_{-2h} (dashed line) and T_0 (straight line) fluorescence emission spectra, panel C: F_{Heat} treatment; difference spectrum (dotted line) of T_0 and $T_{11.5h}$, T_0 (dashed line) and $T_{11.5h}$

(straight line) fluorescence emission spectra, panel D: $F_{\text{Heat+NPQ}}$ treatment; difference spectra (dotted line) of T_0 and $T_{11.5h}$, T_0 (dashed line) and $T_{11.5h}$ (straight line) fluorescence emission spectra.85

Figure 2.2.4: Xanthophyll pigment concentrations as a function of sampling time (h). Diatoxanthin (pg cell^{-1}) for F_{Heat} and $F_{\text{Heat+NPQ}}$ (A), and F_{NPQ} (B), De-epoxidation status for F_{Heat} and $F_{\text{Heat+NPQ}}$ (C), and F_{NPQ} (D), xanthophyll pool concentration for F_{Heat} and $F_{\text{Heat+NPQ}}$ (E), and F_{NPQ} (F); ramping time for thermal stress treatments is indicated between $T_{.2h}$ and T_{0h} on the x-axis, where F_{NPQ} sampling is displayed from T_{0h} ; Tukey HSD results are indicated in lower case letters; mean \pm SEM, $n = 4$ are displayed.88

Figure 3.1: Sampling location Heron Island, Capricorn Bunker Group, Great Barrier Reef, in Australia ($23^{\circ}26'31.20''\text{S}$ $151^{\circ}54'50.40''\text{E}$) and a close-up of sampling site indicated as (1) (adapted from Krämer et al., 2012). Map was produced using Ocean Data View (Schlitzer, 2011, <http://odv.awi.de>) with data from ‘Coral reef distribution of the World (2010)’ provided by UNEP-WCMC.111

Figure 3.2: Photosynthetic active radiation (PAR) intensities, as well as incubating temperature throughout the experimental time. PAR is indicated through grey solid line and incubating temperature indicated with black dotted line.121

Figure 3.3: F_V/F_M of midday dark-adapted specimens with (+LM) and without lincomycin (-LM) treatment (panel A: *P. damicornis*, panel B: *P. decussata*) and night measurements of with (+LM) and without lincomycin (-LM) treatment (panel C: *P. damicornis*, panel D: *P. decussata*). Tukey HSD results are indicated; mean \pm SEM; $n = 4$124

Figure 3.4: Intact psbA concentrations A) *P. damicornis*, C) *P. decussata*; fragmented psbA to intact psbA ratios B) *P. damicornis*, D) *P. decussata* as well as are displayed for all experimental sampling events (days) for treatments of high light exposure without lincomycin at midday (midday – LM) and night time (night – LM), as well as high light exposure with lincomycin at midday (midday + LM) and night time (night + LM). T0 measurements were taken n=4 at midday and night representative for both treatment conditions. Tukey HSD results are indicated; mean \pm SEM; n = 4. 127

Figure 3.5: Photorepair (%) derived through Chl *a* fluorescence (F_V/F_M levels) and from intact psbA concentration changes for *P. damicornis* (black) and *P. decussata* (grey) Between species differences are indicated with an asterisk; mean \pm SEM; n = 4. 128

Figure 3.6: Quenching parameters of *P. damicornis* and *P. decussata* for all experimental sampling times (h) for midday high light exposure without lincomycin A) *P. damicornis*, b) *P. decussata* and for midday high light exposure with lincomycin treatment C) *P. damicornis*, D) *P. decussata*; Tukey HSD results are indicated; mean \pm SEM; n = 4. 130

Figure 3.7: Gross (black circles) and net photosynthesis (black triangles) and respiration (clear circles) of for midday high light exposure without lincomycin; A) *P. damicornis* and B) *P. decussata*; as well as high light exposure with lincomycin treatment C) *P. damicornis* and B) *P. decussata* for all sampling times (h); zero is indicated as dashed grey line; Tukey HSD results are indicated; mean \pm SEM; n = 4. 132

Figure 3.8: Xanthophyll pigments Dt and Dd normalised to Chl *a* for midday and night time of high light exposure without lincomycin (A) *P. damicornis* and (B) *P. decussata* (legend indicated in A), and for midday and night time of high light exposure with lincomycin (C) *P.*

damicornis and (D) *P. decussata* (legend indicated in C); and the resulting de-epoxidation status (DPS) for both species of high light exposure without lincomycin (E) and with lincomycin treatment (F) (species legend indicated in E). Tukey HSD results are indicated; mean \pm SEM; n = 4. 135

Figure S 3.6.1: Representative immunoblot for psbA immunoblots. The presented blot shows samples of the final sampling event. 152

Figure 4.1: Schematic of the photosynthesis bioreactor (PBR); the system consists of a laptop for data management and device operation, an Algae-Growth-PAM computer interface as an optional controlling device, a temperature controlled water-bath and a pump, which feeds into the water jacket of the sample chamber. Within the sample chamber 4 sensor slots (indicated as circled symbols: pH, temperature, O₂ optode, 4 π PAR sensor) and a PAM fiber optic (45° angle to the specimen) are recording measurements within the liquid-phase at or near the specimen surface; the mounting spots for the front-mounted LED panel are indicated as white circles on the sample chamber; the gas-phase was a closed circuit connecting a cold-trap, a drying column, an IRGA for CO₂ detection, flowmeter, 3-way luer-lock valve for N₂ purging and/or calibration. The gas flow direction is indicated by the arrows (measures are not to size). 160

Figure 4.2: Relative changes (%) of CO₂ concentrations upon equilibration with gas- and liquid-phase (here indicated with a dashed vertical line) to initial CO₂ concentrations. Dark incubations of *Pocillopora damicornis* while incubating in FSW with two salinity regimes, salinity of 35 and 25 and resulting DIC species concentrations. The DIC species concentrations (HCO₃⁻, CO₃⁻², CO₂ μ mol kg SW⁻¹) and total DIC (μ mol kg SW⁻¹) of salinity 35 and salinity 25, as well as the % loss in DIC species concentrations and total DIC from

salinity of 35 to salinity of 25 are indicated in the table above the graph. Displayed are mean \pm SEM (n = 3). 169

Figure 4.3: Results of gas- and liquid-phase equilibration times for CO₂ concentrations (ppm) as a function of incubation time for *Pocillopora damicornis* (n=4, standard errors are indicated) incubated at irradiances above and below O₂ compensation point (E_c), (a) 350 $\mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and (b) 40 $\mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, respectively and post-illumination incubation of above and below E_c irradiances (c), (d) are displayed. N₂ purged and closed system CO₂ readings without biological specimen and FSW (liquid-phase) are inserted in panel a) for comparison; each panel includes information about equilibration phase time indicated with a circled arrow and equilibration time (t) next to it; pre- and post-equilibration phase are additionally indicated by separation with a dotted line in each panel. Displayed are mean \pm SEM (n = 3). To highlight gas exchange variation of light incubations below E_c, replicates were plotted individually (b). 172

Figure 4.4: Gas exchange rates of O₂ (open circles) and DIC (Pg_{DIC} and Pnet_{DIC}/R_{CO2} exchange (closed circles) as a function of irradiance (78 – 1100 $\mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) are displayed; (a) gross photosynthetic rates (Pg_{O2} and Pg_{DIC}), (b) net photosynthetic rates (Pnet_{O2} and Pnet_{DIC}), (c) post-illumination respiration rates (R_{O2} and R_{CO2}); mean \pm SEM (n = 3), standard errors are indicated, dotted line indicates zero (in panel b and c). Tukey HSD results are indicated. 175

Figure 4.5: $\Delta F/F_M'$ (closed circles), relative electron transport rate (rETR) (open stars) and NPQ (open circles) displayed as a function of irradiance (78 – 1100 $\mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$); n=4, standard errors are indicated; legends are included in the axis labelling to not complicate the display of the data symbols in the graph panel. 178

Figure 4.6: Replicate estimates of metabolic quotients are displayed as a function of irradiance ($78 - 1100 \mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$) with exponential trend lines for (a) respiratory quotient considering the holobiont (RQc), (b) photosynthetic quotient considering the holobiont (PQnet), (c) photosynthetic quotient considering the algal symbiont (PQz); replicates are indicated (n=4). 180

Figure 4.7: Conceptual display of a theoretical stoichiometric analysis of electron equivalents estimated from metabolic gas exchange rates and Chl fluorometry derived electron transport rates to describe light utilisation of aquatic phototrophs in terms of alternative electron pathways and C fixation as a function of irradiance (adapted from Wilhelm and Selmar, 2011). 186

Figure 5.1: Dissipative energy quenching pathways displayed as the combined total light energy input of 1, at nine irradiances for (A) *P. damicornis* and (B) *P. decussata*. Photosynthetic efficiency of photosystem II indicated from bottom to top Y(II) (black bars), non-regulated non-photochemical quenching Y(NO) (light grey bars), regulated non-photochemical quenching Y(NPQ) (dark grey bars); (mean \pm SEM; *P. decussata*: n=3 and *P. damicornis*: n=4); Tukey HSD results are indicated ($p < 0.05$). 212

Figure 5.3: A) $R_{\text{light O}_2}$ rates as a function of light intensity at 6 irradiances, *P. damicornis* (clear circle) and *P. decussata* (clear triangle); B) respiratory rate changes of $R_{\text{light O}_2}$ (white symbols) and $R_{\text{EPIR O}_2}$ (black symbols) relative to pre-illumination rates (R_{dark}) for *P. damicornis* (circles) and *P. decussata* (triangles) are displayed for 6 irradiances; (mean \pm SEM; $R_{\text{light O}_2}$: n=2, $R_{\text{EPIR O}_2}$: n=4); Tukey HSD results are indicated ($p < 0.05$). 217

Figure 5.4: Photosynthesis to respiration ratios (P/R ratios) of microsensor derived gross photosynthesis (GP_{micro}) to light respiration rates ($R_{\text{light O}_2}$); *P. decussata* (streaked bars) and *P. damicornis* (clear bars) at nine irradiances; dotted line indicates $P = R$ level where ratios > 1 indicate autotrophy was efficient to meet coral holobiont respiratory demand and < 1 indicate that respiratory demand of the holobiont was greater than autotrophic output; (mean \pm SEM; $n=2$); Tukey HSD results are indicated for *P. decussata* ($p < 0.05$), no significant differences were found for *P. damicornis*.....220

List of Tables

Table 2.1.1: Kinetic parameters obtained from the kinetic modeling of the experimental data recorded from *Symbiodinium* cells under control condition, F_C ; A, kinetic rates; B weighted eigenvector matrix; C, lifetimes (ps) attributed to different model compartments.....43

Tables 2.1.2: Kinetic parameters obtained from the kinetic modeling of the experimental data recorded from *Symbiodinium* cells under high light stress, F_{HL} ; A, kinetic rates; B weighted eigenvector matrix; C, lifetimes (ps) attributed to different model compartments.....44

Tables 2.1.3: Kinetic parameters obtained from the kinetic modeling of the experimental data recorded from *Symbiodinium* cells under elevated temperature stress, F_{HT} ; A, kinetic rates; B weighted eigenvector matrix; C, lifetimes (ps) attributed to different model compartments..45

Tables 2.1.4: Kinetic parameters obtained from the kinetic modeling of the experimental data recorded from *Symbiodinium* cells under coral bleaching condition, F_B46

Table 2.1.2: Relative excitation vectors (excitation probability for the different compartments), spillover rate, NPQ rate and average lifetimes in each of the four treatments; for all four treatment conditions; F_C – control condition, F_{HL} – high light stress, F_{HT} – thermal stress, F_B – bleaching conditions (combined thermal and high light stress).....51

Table 2.2.1.1: Amplitude (relative units; 0-1) and area (%) of component bands (675, 688, 701 and 721 nm) of fluorescence emission spectra at 77K. Means (\pm S.E.) shown. *P* values show difference over time for each component in each treatment. Significant differences indicated by *, with superscript letters indicating Tukey HSD results ($\alpha = 0.05$)..... 79

Table 2.2.1.2: Amplitude (relative units; 0-1) and area (%) of component bands (675, 688, 701 and 721 nm) of fluorescence emission spectra at 77K. Means (\pm S.E.) shown. *P* values show difference over time for each component in each treatment. Significant differences indicated by *, with superscript letters indicating Tukey HSD results ($\alpha = 0.05$).....80

Table 2.2.3: T-test statistical analyses ($\alpha = 0.05$) results for 77K fluorescence emission spectra amplitude differences at critical wavelengths 672, 683, 701 and 721 nm, comparing F_{Heat} and $F_{\text{Heat+NPQ}}$ at the start of the experiment (T_{-2h}), after 2 h of ramping to experimental temperature at 30.5 °C (T_{0h} ; F_{Heat} : in the dark, $F_{\text{Heat+NPQ}}$: at ambient light) and at conclusion of experimental incubation ($T_{11.5h}$; total of 9.5 h in treatment conditions; F_{Heat} : 6 h dark + thermal stress and 3.5 h of high light at the end of treatment incubation; $F_{\text{Heat+NPQ}}$: 9.5 h of combination of high light + thermal stress).84

Table 2.2.4: Density of *Symbiodinium* cells per mL ($\times 10^5$) at the start and end of each of the three treatments.....89

Table 4.1: Parameters of the carbonate system each of 4 sampled light intensity incubations; pH, total dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC), total inorganic carbon speciations (CO_2 , CO_3^{-2} , HCO_3^-), total alkalinity (TA) ($n=3$; mean \pm SEM).167

Table 4.2: Quantitative parameters derived from fitted net photosynthetic DIC uptake rates as a function of irradiances applied during P – E curves ($n=3$; mean \pm SEM).177

Table 5.1: Biometric measures of the two hard coral species examined ($n=4$; mean \pm SEM) displaying total chlorophyll (Chl *a* + Chl *c*₂), algal cell densities per coral surface area and total Chl per cell (significant differences are indicated with an asterisk).210

Table 5.2: Quantitative curve parameters of variable Chl fluorescence derived from fitted relative electron transport rates (rETR) and microsensor measurement derived gross photosynthesis (GP) rates as a function of incident irradiance. $rETR_{max}$ (a.u.), GP_{max} (nmol $O_2\ cm^{-3}\ s^{-1}$), $E_{k\ rETR}$ and $E_{k\ GP}$ ($\mu mol\ photons\ m^{-2}\ s^{-1}$) as well as α_{rETR} and α_{GP} are presented; n=4 for *P. damicornis* and n=3 for *P. decussata* mean \pm SEM.....215

Table 5.3: Algal symbiont characteristics at CO_2 light compensation point (E_c), metabolic gas exchange characteristics for $< CO_2E_c$: gross photosynthetic (GP) activity (mmol O_2 mg Chl $a^{-1}\ cm^{-2}$), respiratory activity measured as CO_2 exchange during light ($R_{light\ CO_2}$) and during dark ($R_{EPIR\ CO_2}$) (mmol C mg Chl $a^{-1}\ cm^{-2}$) (significant differences are indicated with an asterisk); n=4, mean \pm SEM.....218

Abbreviations

acpPC	Chl <i>a/c</i> ₂ – Peridinin-binding protein complex
AEPS	Alternative electron pathways
ATP	Adenosin triphosphate
CCM	Carbon concentrating mechanism
CET	Cyclic electron transport
Chl	Chlorophyll
CO ₂ E _c	CO ₂ light compensation point
DCMU	3-(3,4-Dichlorophenyl)-1,1-dimethylurea
Dd	Diadinoxanthin
Dt	Diatoxanthin
DIC	Dissolved inorganic carbon
DO	Dissolved oxygen
E _c	Light compensation point
ENSO	El Niño-Southern Oscillation
ETR	Electron transport rate
FSW	Filtered seawater
GFP	Green fluorescent protein

GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GP	Gross photosynthesis
GPP	Gross primary productivity
HPLC	High performance liquid chromatography
IRGA	Infrared gas analyser
LET	Linear electron transport
MAA	Mycosporine-like amino acid
MAP	Mehler-Ascorbate-Peroxidase cycle
NADPH	Nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide phosphate hydrogen
NPQ	Non-photochemical-quenching
OEC	Oxygen evolving complex
PAM	Pulse- amplitude- modulate fluorometry
PBR	Photobioreactor
PCP	Peridinin-Chl <i>a</i> -binding protein complex
PPR	Photoprotective pigment ratio
PSP	Photosynthetic pigment pool
PQP	Plastoquinone pool
PSI	Photosystem I
PSII	Photosystem II

PSU	Photosynthetic unit
RC	Reaction center
ROS	Reactive oxygen species
SOD	Superoxide dismutase
SOI	Southern Oscillation Index
XC	Xanthophyll cycling
XP	Xanthophyll pool

Abstract

Hard corals are a living association of a cnidarian and microalgae of the genus *Symbiodinium*. This symbiosis is critical for corals to survive in oligotrophic tropical waters. The algal symbionts reside within the host cells receiving photosynthetic substrate in form of dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) and in turn transfer photosynthate to their coral host. The photosynthetic performance of the algal symbionts is directly dependent on the DIC substrate delivery, which in turn can have implications on the photosynthate translocation to their coral hosts.

Under thermal and or high light stress, the algal symbiont's photosynthetic substrate can become limited, so that the photosynthetic rate slows down and excess light energy, not utilised for photosynthesis, is dissipated to avoid photodamage. Upon prolonged exposure under these stress conditions, the symbiotic association can dissociate and result in coral bleaching. It was of interest to understand ongoing processes governing the dissociation of a coral symbiosis, focussing on cultured algal symbionts as well as when associated with a coral host.

The photosynthetic apparatus of *Symbiodinium* has different pathways for dissipating excess energy to alleviate the impact of high light stress. Here a novel non-photochemical quenching mechanism was described through the application of picosecond chlorophyll fluorescence measurements on *Symbiodinium* clade C cells suggesting a heterogeneously organized photosystem II (PSII) pool. A model was developed, revealing the re-organization of the alga's photosynthetic apparatus under normal and photoprotective modes, during thermal and high light stress. We propose a new "super-quenching" mechanism, triggered when quenching at the peripheral antennas is insufficient to protect PSII from photodamage. PSII

then transfers its excited state energy to PSI, transforming a non-spillover PSII pool into a spillover pool. The inherently higher stability of PSI and high quenching efficiency of P_{700}^{+} allows dumping excess energy to heat, and resulting in an almost complete cessation of photosynthetic electron transport. A similar breakdown of *Symbiodinium*'s photosynthesis could occur when living *in hospite* associated with corals and this could provide a trigger for coral bleaching.

Symbiodinium is equipped with light-harvesting and reaction centre components in the thylakoid membrane including a water-soluble peridinin-chlorophyll (chl) *a*-protein complex (PCP), and a membrane-bound chl *a*-chl *c*₂-peridinin- protein complex (acpPC), along with typical photosynthetic electron transport systems such as the PSII reaction centre and the chl *a*- P_{700} reaction centre complex of PSI. Recent findings suggest that structural changes to PSII associated light harvesting pigment-protein antenna complexes (LHC), membrane intrinsic acpPC and peripherally associated PCP, in *Symbiodinium* are a mean of photoprotection, in addition to xanthophyll cycling. How LHC movement and xanthophyll cycling possibly complement each other under thermal and high light conditions, corresponding to coral bleaching conditions (the expulsion of algal symbionts from the coral host) has been addressed in this thesis. Here it could be revealed that thermal stress is the main precursor for movement of light harvesting complexes in order to shunt excess energy away from PSII. The findings presented here demonstrate the substantial non-photochemical quenching capacity of cultured *Symbiodinium*.

Coral bleaching resilience has been found to be species-specific, with differential impairment of *Symbiodinium*'s photobiology. Whilst much is known about the importance of considering *Symbiodinium* clades and resulting differential photophysiological characteristics affecting the overall coral physiology, the influence of the host upon autotrophic/photophysiological performance of their symbionts is largely unstudied. With the application of an inhibitor

preventing the *de novo* synthesis of the PSII core protein D1, coral species were incubated in natural high light stress conditions for 4 days. Gross photoinhibitory conditions of *Symbiodinium* clade C1 were examined when harboured in two distinct coral host organisms. Algal symbionts harboured in *Pavona decussata*, a bleaching resilient coral species displayed lower photodamage, compared to algal symbionts harboured in *Pocillopora damicornis*, a bleaching sensitive coral species, which was found to exhibit different photoprotective strategies. Despite differences in photodamage and resulting photorepair requirements (re-synthesis of D1 and incorporation in the PSII to create a functional reaction centre), both species displayed constant maximum quantum yields throughout exposure to high light conditions. Results clearly suggest that the photophysiological viability of *Symbiodinium* can be influenced depending on the harbouring coral host species.

In order to understand intricate physiological processes occurring in a coral holobiont and to further assess interdependencies of a *Symbiodinium*-coral host symbiosis, a closed metabolic chamber system (photobioreactor; PBR) was developed for the simultaneous assessment of three key integrated parameters of aquatic oxygenic phototrophs; chlorophyll fluorometry, oxygen and dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) exchange. The performance of the PBR was evaluated for *in hospite* *Symbiodinium* associated with the scleractinian coral *Pocillopora damicornis*. The ‘two-phase’ PBR utilised circulation of a gas-phase through a liquid-phase (seawater) along with continuous stirring to reach equilibrium and allowed for determination of CO₂ as an indirect measure of changes in DIC concentration within the liquid-phase. Simultaneous measures of photosynthetic efficiency (using pulse amplitude modulated fluorometry) and metabolic gas exchange (using state-of-the art dissolved oxygen sensor technology and an infra-red gas analyser for CO₂ detection) were performed. The developed instrumental setup can be used to examine any aquatic phototroph, where the preliminary results presented, show the great capacity of this application.

Further, the novel PBR and additional O₂ microsensors were used to examine the photophysiology and metabolic gas exchange of the symbiont subclade (C1) harboured in two morphologically different coral species; *Pocillopora damicornis* and *Pavona decussata*. Here light respiratory dynamics were described through the application of O₂ microsensors under photosynthesis – irradiance (P – E) curve measurements. Comparable light respiratory dynamics but differing gross primary production, as well as light utilisation were found between the two species examined. *P. decussata*, displayed a much lower CO₂ light compensation point at only half the photon flux density compared to *P. damicornis*, indicating differing DIC supply to its algal symbionts. It was therefore concluded that *P. damicornis* has a comparable respiratory activity per symbiont to *P. decussata*, but as *P. damicornis* harbours less than half the symbionts per unit area compared to *P. decussata*, the holobiont exhibits a higher CO₂ compensation point (CO₂E_c) irradiance. Dissipative energy pathways also differed during photosynthesis-irradiance (P – E) curve measurements, where *P. decussata* displayed an increase of non-light induced energy quenching (Y(NO)) and *P. damicornis* increased active energy quenching (Y(NPQ)). O₂ microsensor derived light respiration rates were demonstrated for the first time from P – E curve measurements for coral holobionts. This is a significant contribution to the field as respiration increased with irradiance ~ 20 times compared to steady-state dark respiration for both species. Light respiration rate results demonstrated here clearly highlight that enhanced post-illumination rates, which have commonly been used to infer about light respiratory activity, are not reflecting the much greater actual light respiratory activity.

In concert, this thesis has revealed that *Symbiodinium* is equipped with a broad capacity of non-photochemical quenching pathways, where the species-specific pairing of *Symbiodinium* and its coral host can mediate photoprotective capacity. The importance of sufficient DIC as

photosynthetic substrate available to the algal symbionts has been identified as a possible key role governing bleaching resilience in hard coral species.